

STAT

3 FEB 1975

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director for Intelligence

SUBJECT : Project SAFE - Talking Points for DDA

1. This memorandum responds to your request for talking points concerning the DDA memorandum of 24 January 1975 on Project SAFE.

2. Mr. Blake's memorandum basically deals with two facets of SAFE. First (his second), is the end product of the "feasibility panel" (which CRS prefers to call the "technical advisory panel") and the difference is more than semantic. Mr. Blake wants the panel's blessing before resources are committed. He wants the panel to say either "go do it; we know you can" or hold up design until the state of the art makes the risk less. The panel is not likely to make either statement. They may, however, say that SAFE looks doable with the risks being outweighed by the potential gains. Whether the resources are adequate or the time frame is realistic depends in very large part on things that the panel can't know--how much internal support will be provided? What will OMB, etc., do about the FY 1977 funding level?

3. More importantly, however, the panel will not be able to come up with a "hard" judgment until some resources are used. Dr. Perry, you will recall, wants "simulation" before rendering a "final" judgment and so does CRS. This requires cash outlays.

4. Thus, the DDA wish to await panel approval before continuation is a little unrealistic. The panel clearly should advise, now and in the future, pro or con on continued investment on the total concept and on the individual parts as we proceed towards and into each. Basically, however, we do not believe that we can get the clear-cut, once-and-for-all-times verdict that the DDA seems to desire short of much before 1980.

Working Paper --
Destroy After
1 Jan 1977

STAT

SUBJECT: Project SAFE - Talking Points for DDA

5. If possible, the February session should result in a conclusion by the panel on whether to proceed. If we can't get it then, we should have another session in late March or early April. In the meantime, CRS, at least, must act as if a favorable diagnosis will be forthcoming. Prospects for success and for the first operational date will both in part be results of how much cooperation we get in the meantime from DDA.

6. The second DDA question (Mr. Blake's first) has to do with how much of OJCS's resources needs go to the SAFE development. He says 15 people. We think that the 15 figure is perhaps double the requirement for at least the next year. Dr. Bitzer, you may recall, said that the SAFE is was now about the right size and had about the right mix of programmers and systems analysts. We think that he continues to be correct. The problem is that OJCS management has got to be actively involved in the design. The involvement must include OJCS commitment (within reason, of course) as the development occurs so we do not have to do all of the work for the design development and then have it done again when OJCS begins to implement.

7. CRS sees something more like six to eight full-time SAFE people concerned with the system hardware configuration and software. If OJCS is willing, CRS would provide at least three, maybe five, of these people. Attached is a wiring diagram (in OJCS possession, also) that shows the organization and the kinds of numbers that we see for the SAFE team.

8. As we get down the pike, I see the additional people involved in writing software. These individuals would not be part of the SAFE management team. They would be writing specific programs to specifications, and it would make relatively little difference whether they are employees or contractors who could be either individual or corporate. OJCS as we move down the road to SAFE implementation will clearly have a major commitment of personnel. How major is not presently discernable because personnel requirements will be the result of several undetermined factors--what kind of equipment will be used to operate what kind of software that requires what kind of operator intervention.

STAT


Approved For Release 2005/11/23 : CIA-RDP80B01495R001200150013-2

SUBJECT: Project SAFE - Talking Points for DDA

9. Thus, in my view, the DDA overstates his present problem. OJCS has a full-timer on SAFE and is committed to providing another. These two plus the CRS three to five equal five to seven, which leaves OJCS a commitment of an additional one to three.

10. Again, in the CRS view, numbers are not what is important. What is important is OJCS participation in the design decisions as they are being made and not after the structure is complete. Who is assigned is far more important than how many.

11. There is an alternative. CRS, with currently committed OJCS participation (two), does the whole design and OJCS will then be bound to implement as CRS plans. CRS doesn't think that this is practical and doesn't think that OJCS should think so either.


H. C. EISENBEISS
Director, Central Reference Service


Attachment:
As stated

STAT

STAT

Approved For Release 2005/11/23 : CIA-RDP80B01495R001200150013-2
PROJECT SAFE
(Org/Direction/Control)

23 JAN 1975



STAT

STAT

Approved For Release 2005/11/23 : CIA-RDP80B01495R001200150013-2
Approved For Release 2005/11/23 : CIA-RDP80B01495R001200150013-2
has good foundation in both hdwr/software!)

STAT

18 February 1975

NOTE TO: Director, Central Reference
Service

RE : SAFE

Harry--

I have read your comments on Blake's memo. It seems to me that [] should do some planning that should help the Technical Advisory Panel, me, and Blake. The plan (or schedule) should lay out several decision points together with dates and kinds of data needed. We should make an effort to have the data available (or estimated) so that the TAP can advise us on whether to go to the next point. Perhaps this is already done for the TAP, but I have not seen it.

If we have something like this in hand, I think that Blake and the Director could have a better idea of where we are going and what will be needed to get there.

[]
Ed Proctor

A
C
T
I
O
N

STAT

STAT

STAT